

Remarks:

Claims 1–27 were previously pending with claims 1, 7, 12, 17, and 22 being independent. Claims 22–26 are presently cancelled, and claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 are presently amended. Therefore, claims 1–21 and 27 are currently pending with claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 being independent.

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2005, claims 22–26 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1–6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, claims 1–21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,000, in view of Pfeiffer, "Safety Plan Nets Results at Teksid."

Regarding the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to recite "a *computer-readable medium encoded with a code segment operable to enable a computer to perform date gap analysis.*" Thus, claim 1 conforms to the requirements of § 112.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 1 based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants notes that claim 1 has further been amended to recite "wherein the date gap analysis includes determining an elapsed time between consecutive events *and an average elapsed time*, and wherein the output indicates a value for each elapsed time *and the average elapsed time*", emphasis added. The new language is supported in the specification at page 8, line 31 through page 9, line 1, and FIG. 4.

Applicants assert that the prior art references of record do not teach or suggest each of the limitations of claim 1. For example, the prior art references do not teach or suggest a system that performs date gap analysis that includes "determining an elapsed time between consecutive events and an average elapsed time" and generates an output that "indicates a value for each elapsed time and the average elapsed time."

Turning now to the rejections of independent claims 7, 12, and 17, Applicants

note that these claims have been amended to recite elements similar to the new language of claim 1. Therefore, the arguments set forth above in relation to claim 1 apply to claims 7, 12, and 17.

The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, 12, and 17. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully Submitted,

By



Thomas B. Luebbering, Reg. No. 37,874
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City, Missouri 64108

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT(S)